

## REMARKS

Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the notice that claims 1-7, 9, 17-26, 28-35, 37, 40-44 and 46-48 are allowed.

Remaining claims 10-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Geist in view of Schmeidler and further in view of Bisbee. Applicant respectfully notes that claim 10 includes similar language as set forth in allowable claim 1 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons. For example, claim 10 includes determining a digital signature verification error based on a received message header identifier associated with a public key certificate identifier. This limitation is also in claim 1. In addition, claim 10 requires generating a digital signature verification map containing a plurality of acceptable message header identifiers associated with a public key identifier...in response to determining the digital signature verification error. This is also set forth in claim 1. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 10-15 are also in condition for allowance. The dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Claims 38 and 45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Geist in view of Schmeidler and further in view of Bisbee as applied to claim 10 and further in view of Cooper. Applicant respectfully notes that in the “Response to Arguments” section of the office action, it states that the claim shows intended use in that “a recitation directed to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be used does not distinguish the claimed apparatus from the prior art...” (page 2 of office action). (Emphasis added). Applicant notes that this quotation refers to a claimed apparatus. Claims 38 and 45 however are directed to a

method, not an apparatus. As such, this argument is inapplicable and the claim is in condition for allowance.

In arguendo, Applicant respectfully submits that the method is not directed to an intended use but instead, actually claims steps that comprise a patentable method. These steps are not described in the cited references, alone or in combination. It is alleged that the Cooper reference discloses the features in column 9, second and sixth paragraphs and column 10, first paragraph. However, Cooper is directed to an Internet answering machine and shows in FIG. 4 and describes in the cited portions merely a display screen that displays phone numbers or names of callers and the date and time of the call or the subject of an email, for example. The cited portion also describes that a telephone number may be converted to a caller's name using a prestored directory in memory. An email address may also be converted into a corresponding tag and displayed in place of, or in addition to the email address. However claim 38 requires, among other things, generating a trusted alias map containing the plurality of acceptable message identifiers in at least one associated subject alias. The cited portion of Cooper does not describe a trusted – such as digitally signed by a trusted authority – alias map. As such, Cooper does not disclose the features of this claim as alleged in the “Response to Arguments” section.

In addition, Applicant also respectfully notes that the claim has also been misapprehended. The office action, on page 5, alleges that Geist, Schmeidler and Bisbee disclosed “determination of a digital signature verification error (see as applied to claim 10 above)”. However, claim 38 does not require this language and it does not appear in the claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection is also improper and that the claim should be passed to allowance.

Claim 45 is also in condition for allowance since it requires that the trusted alias map identify multiple public key certificates associated with at least one email name. Again, the Cooper reference alleged to teach the features does not describe any trusted alias map -- such as one digitally signed by a trusted authority. Accordingly, the claim is also in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8/11/07

By: Christopher J. Reckamp  
Christopher J. Reckamp  
Registration No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammlholz, P. C.  
222 N. LaSalle Street  
Chicago, IL 60601  
PHONE: (312) 609-7599  
FAX: (312) 609-5005